



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,565	07/30/2003	Min-Ho Seo	P24001	6472
7055	7590	02/21/2007	EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			SCHLIE, PAUL W	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2186				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/21/2007		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com
pto@gbpatent.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/629,565	SEO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Paul W. Schlie	2186		

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Paul W. Schlie (USPTO).

(3) Joshua M. Povsner (Applicant's Representative).

(2) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 7 February 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

all

Prior art documents discussed:

see below

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: reviewed post allowance submitted IDS references, and agreed that although a multi-media device as disclosed is well known in general, no evidence of such a device utilizing a remote storage device of sufficient capacity to credibly store multi-media data whose power is conditionally sourced from said multi-media device yet accessed wirelessly was known of by either; and thereby considered non-obvious in its specific claimed combination..